DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 058 UD 024 331

AUTHOR Stanley, Cheryl; And Others
TITLE Magnet Schools: Ninth Annual Final Report, 1983-84.
INSTITUTION Houston Independent School District, Tex.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 33p.; For the eighth annual report, see UD 024 330.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Black Students; Compliance (Legal); *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; Hispanic Americans; *Magnet Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Racial Composition; Racial Integration; *School Desegregation; Student Transportation
IDENTIFIERS *Houston Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

The Houston Independent School District operated 78 magnet schools during 1983-84. Located on 70 campuses, the programs represented all grade levels and ranged from fine arts programs to extended instructional day programs and programs for the academically able student. During 1983-84, the magnet school plan accomplished its stated objectives (the first four were defined by the 1975 U.S. District Court decree under which the magnet plan was implemented.) (1) It reduced the number of ethnically isolated schools from 121 in the baseline year of 1974-75 to 106. (2) It reduced the number of students attending ethnically isolated schools from 54.9% in 1974-75 to 46.9%. (3) Free transportation was provided to 12,827 students, an increase of 700 students. (4) The overall makeup of the magnet school and Cluster Center student population was 37.6% Black, 26.7% Hispanic, and 35.9% White. (5) The magnet schools accomplished 336, or 93% of the 361 proposed performance objectives. The objectives most frequently not met concerned enrollment, recruitment, and academic achievement. Expansion of the Magnet School Plan and refinement of existing programs will offer more students the opportunity to participate in what has proven to be a largely successful program. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cheryl Stanley
Houston Wesleyan Sch.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MAGNET SCHOOLS
NINTH ANNUAL FINAL REPORT
1983-84

Prepared by
Cheryl Stanley, Research Assistant

With Assistance from

Don Compton, Research Assistant
Barbara Ferrell, Research Assistant
Jyl Giles, Executive Director

Joe Stubbs
Assistant Superintendent
Planning, Research and Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
History of Desegregation in Houston	1
Development of Houston's Magnet School Program	2
Evaluation Design	4
Evaluation Results	4
Objectives Related to Court Order	5
Objective 1	5
Objective 2	9
Objective 3	10
Objective 4	11
Program Objective Attainment	21
Summary	27

Tables

Table 1	Number and Percent of One-race Schools by School Level for the Past Ten School Years	5
Table 2	Schools District-wide Which Changed in One-race School Status	6
Table 3	One-race Minority Elementary Magnet School Campuses	7
Table 4	One-race Minority Secondary Magnet School Campuses	8
Table 5	District Enrollment and Ethnic Percentages	8
Table 6	Percentage of Students Attending One-race Schools	9
Table 7	Final Student Enrollment for Add-on Magnet Programs	12
Table 8	Final Student Enrollment for School-Within-a-School Magnet Programs	13-14
Table 9	Final Student Enrollment for Separate and Unique Magnet Schools	14

Table 10	Final Student Participation for Cluster Center Magnet Programs	15
Table 11	Final Student Enrollment in All Magnet Programs	15
Table 12	SWS Magnet Satellite Programs Which Met District's Ethnic Enrollment Goal	17
Table 13	Final Student Enrollment for In-Town Consortium Magnet School Programs	18-19
Table 14	Percentage of White Enrollment at AOP Magnet Schools	20
Table 15	Percentage of White Enrollment at Separate and Unique Magnet Schools for May, 1982 and May, 1983	20
Table 16	Number of Objectives Proposed and Met by Magnet Schools	22-23
Table 17	Number and Percent of Objectives Proposed and Met by Magnet School Level	24
Table 18	Number and Percent of Objectives Proposed and Met by Magnet School Level for the Past Seven Years	25
Table 19	Type and Level of Objectives Written for 1983-84	26
Table 20	Number of Objectives Not Met by Type and Level	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
NINTH ANNUAL REPORT
1983-1984

The attached Magnet School Project Evaluation addresses four objectives defined by the U.S. District Court decree of July 11, 1975, under which the Magnet School Plan was implemented. In addition, the report summarizes the accomplishment of campus level objectives by the seventy Magnet School Programs and problems encountered during Phase IX of the Magnet School Plan operation. The following statements summarize Magnet School Plan accomplishments during the 1983-84 school year.

1. Reduce the number of ethnically isolated schools.
   This objective was met.

The number of ethnically isolated schools for 1983-84 was 106 as compared to 121 during the baseline year of 1974-75. With the exception of the first year of Magnet school implementation, the number of one-race schools has fluctuated from 98 to 106.

2. Reduce the number of students attending ethnically isolated schools.
   This objective was met.

During the baseline year of 1974-75, 54.9% of the students in the District attended ethnically isolated schools. This past year only 46.9% were in this category. With the exception of the first year of Magnet School implementation, the percent of students attending one-race schools has fluctuated from 43.9% to 47.0%.

3. Provide free transportation to Magnet students.
   This objective was met.

The Transportation Department reported transporting a total of 12,827 students to Magnet schools this year. This is an increase of 700 students. This total includes majority-to-minority transfer students.

4. Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group.
   This objective was met.

The overall makeup of the Magnet School student population including participants of Cluster Centers was 37.6% Black, 26.7% Hispanic and 35.9% White. Excluding Cluster Center participants, the ethnic makeup was 37.3% Black, 24.6% Hispanic and 38.0% White.

The District provides teacher assignment by ethnic group as part of a larger report to the Court. This report deals with student enrollment figures only.

5. Performance Objectives

The 70 Phase IX Magnet Schools accomplished 336 or 93% of the 361 proposed performance objectives. This is the highest percentage of objectives ever attained by the Magnet School programs. The objectives most frequently not met were enrollment/recruitment objectives, followed by academic achievement objectives.

MAGNET SCHOOL
NINTH ANNUAL REPORT
1983 - 1984

The Houston Independent School District is one of the six largest school districts in the United States and it is the largest district in the South. It is located in southeast Texas in a region referred to as the Upper Texas Gulf Coastal Plain, about fifty miles northwest of the Port of Galveston on the Gulf of Mexico. The Houston Independent School District consists of 312 square miles which occupy the center of both the City of Houston and Harris County. The District has a student enrollment of approximately 189,467 which includes special service schools and is truly multi-ethnic; it is .1% American Indian, 3.1% Asian, 44.1% Black, 30.9% Hispanic and 20.3% White. The Houston Independent School District includes 39.3% of the total enrollment in Harris County.

Of the total student enrollment in Harris County, 70% of the Black students, 61.3% of the Hispanic students and 15.8% of the White students are enrolled in the Houston Independent School District. There are 20 other school districts in Harris County.

The annual budget of the Houston Independent School District is approximately 587 million dollars. These funds support the functioning of 240 school buildings, plus administrative, athletic and support services. The District's 9,894 teachers are assisted by approximately 684 administrators and over 5,000 support personnel.

History of Desegregation

Prior to the United States Supreme Court decisions in Brown vs The Board of Education, the Houston Independent School District existed as a dual school system. That is, there were specific schools reserved for Black students. Following the Brown I and II rulings, HISD went through a cycle of desegregation activities similar to that of most other southern school systems. The most recent of these activities has been an extensive Magnet School Plan.

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) began school desegregation in the fall of 1960 when it implemented a grade per year transfer plan. Subsequently, the District has been engaged in other methods to achieve integration; e.g., freedom of choice (1967), and school pairing (1971). None of these methods achieved the desired results.

An indication of this failure can be seen in enrollment patterns under the 1971 Pairing Plan. When twenty-two schools in the Houston Independent School District were paired in September of 1971, the enrollment in the twenty-two schools was 16,733. By 1975, enrollment in the twenty-two schools was 15,419. Enrollment in the total District at the time of pairing was 231,922. The enrollment of students in Houston schools as of February 1, 1975, was 210,117.

The drop in enrollment of paired schools and in the total District reflected a drop in the number of families with school age children. In order to reverse this trend, it was imperative that quality educational opportunities be designed.

Moreover, pairing did not promote integration. The 1971 pairing of schools affected 9,957 Black students, 4,923 Hispanic students, and 539 White students. Hispanic students in 1970 were counted as "White." This classification implied that minority students were paired with majority students. In reality, minority students (Black) were paired with minority students (Hispanic). In paired schools where White students were in attendance, there was an exodus of some Whites. Thus Black students were paired with other Black students. For example, in Frost Elementary, there were 375 White students in attendance in 1970. The total number of White students in Frost Elementary and its paired school, Rhoads Elementary, was twenty-two (22) by 1975.

The HISD Magnet School Program Phase I was formally implemented with the beginning of the 1975-76 school year in compliance with the Amended Decree of September 18, 1970, by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. This amended action, designated Civil Action No. 10444, dated July 11, 1975, provided for the depairing of twenty-two (22) elementary schools ordered paired by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, the restoration of the paired schools' original equidistant zone lines, and the implementation of the Magnet School Plan.

DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSTON'S MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAM

The Magnet School Program in Houston was the result of careful study and planning. It began with an action by the Board of Trustees of the Houston Independent School District which established a Task Force on Quality Integrated Education. This task force, established in December, 1974, was directed to seek out and recommend an alternative, or alternatives, to forced school pairing as a desegregation method for the Houston Independent School District. Interestingly, this task force was made up entirely of community people. The community leaders were provided with a budget by the Houston Independent School District's Board of Trustees, and they visited several cities with successful desegregation plans in operation. Not all of the cities visited used Magnet Schools; in fact, very few of them did; but these few cities were those that the task force felt had the most exciting and truly successful plans for integrating students of different ethnic groups.

In February, 1975, the task force presented the Board with its initial recommendations. The primary recommendation was that the Houston Independent School District establish a network of alternative programs or "centers of excellence." These programs, by providing high quality instruction in special areas and the basic skills, would attract students from all ethnic groups and areas of the District, thereby creating quality education in integrated settings.

Soon after the task force made its initial recommendations, the Board of Trustees of the Houston Independent School District established an administrative support team to assist the task force in putting its recommendations into action. This support team, headed by an assistant superintendent and made up of principals,

counselors, and instructional specialists from throughout the District, was charged with the responsibility of designing programs which would qualify as "centers of excellence" and be economically feasible as well. The support team was to draw up initial program specifications, objectives, action steps, budgets, and establish procedures whereby personnel could be appointed to these programs and students could be recruited.

When the administrative support team had finished its work, it presented to the Board initial program designs and installation budgets for approximately 40 Magnet programs. From these, the Board of Trustees selected 32 programs to be implemented during the 1975-76 school year, pending Federal Court approval of the plan. The Board of Trustees then instructed its legal representatives to present this new plan to the Federal District Court as an alternative to the school pairing plan, which was presently in force, involving only 22 schools within HISD.

The Federal District Court heard the District's argument on June 2, 1975, took it under advisement and made no ruling until mid-July, 1975. On July 12, 1975, the Federal District Court approved substitution of the recommended Magnet School Program for Houston's school pairing plan. This adoption date gave the District five weeks to dismantle a pairing plan involving 22 schools, hire 32 Magnet School staffs at 29 different campuses, market the programs, and enroll students in the programs.

The Magnet School Plan as presented to the court and subsequently approved in July, 1975, included the following four objectives:

1. Reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic;

2. Reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic;

3. Provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet Schools outside their regular school attendance zone;

4. Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet School biannually.

To assist in initial implementation, a small portion of the original administrative support team was maintained for the first year of the Magnet school Program's operation. These six people (three field information coordinators, two Magnet school program administrators, and an assistant superintendent) took care of all central office paper work involving the establishment of the Magnet School Program. This included establishing new transportation routes to accommodate Magnet school transfer students.

Since its inception, the Magnet School Program has grown to include seventy-eight unique programs. In 1979, HISD petitioned the court to declare the District unitary, declaring that the District had done all it could to end desegregation. U. S. District Judge O'Conor ordered the Texas Education Agency to work with HISD and suburban districts to devise a plan for voluntary cross-district integration. The Voluntary Interdistrict Education Plan (VIEP) was

formulated in 1980. A second Magnet School Task Force composed of community and HISD personnel began meeting in the fall of 1980 to determine needs for expansion or redirection of the Magnet Program in order to maximize integration efforts and better accommodate the VIEP. On June 17, 1981, Judge Robert O'Conor declared the Houston Independent School District unitary.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) requested a hearing in the process of appeal submitted March 1, 1982. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld Judge O'Conor's decision on February 16, 1983. However, the Houston Independent School District will continue to be monitored by Judge O'Conor through 1984. At the time of the preparation of this report, continued monitoring of the District is pending a decision by the court.

EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation of the Houston Independent School District's Magnet School Plan is objective-based. In the fall, Magnet evaluation team members assist school personnel in developing measurable objectives and related action steps, activities which lead to the attainment of the objectives, for each Magnet program. In the winter, Magnet school coordinators complete a self process audit, indicating progress made toward completing action steps. Product evaluation takes place at the end of the school year. Magnet school coordinators complete self audits documenting the extent to which campus level objectives have been met. This overall Magnet School Final Report addresses District-wide objectives related to the District's petition and the Court order which established the Magnet School Plan and summarizes objective performance across Magnet programs.

EVALUATION RESULTS

This section of the report is divided into two parts. The first presents information regarding each of four objectives related to the Court order. The second is a summary of information about the attainment of campus level objectives and the types of problems encountered.

Objectives Related to the Court Order

The first objective states that HISD will reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

Racially Isolated Schools District-wide

In order to determine whether this objective has been met, the number and proportion of schools which were one-race (i.e., 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic) during the last year of the school pairing plan (1974-75) must be compared to similar figures for Phase IX (1983-84) of the Magnet School Plan. The Texas Education Agency Fall Survey 1983-84 was used to prepare this section of the report. In this report, White is defined as all races other than Black and Hispanic. Table 1 presents the data for the last year of school pairing and for each of the eight years of implementation of the Magnet School Plan.

Table 1

Number and Percent of One-race Schools
by School Level for the Past Ten School Years

	Elementary		Middle/Junior High		Senior High *		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1974-75 Baseline	89	52.4	18	50.0	14	60.9	121	52.8
1975-76	80	47.3	16	44.4	13	56.5	109	47.8
1976-77	77	45.5	14	38.8	12	52.2	103	45.2
1977-78	74	43.5	14	36.8	10	37.0*	98	41.7
1978-79	77	44.8	13	37.1	9	33.3	99	42.5
1979-80	76	44.7	14	40.0	10	35.7	100	42.9
1980-81	81	48.2	14	40.0	11	40.7	106	46.1
1981-82	82	49.1	14	40.0	10	35.7	106	46.1
1982-83	79	47.3	14	40.0	10	37.0	103	45.0
1983-84	80	47.9	15	42.9	11	40.7	106	46.3

* The total number of senior high schools in 1977-78 and following years includes four Magnet separate and unique or alternative campuses not included in 1974-75. The number of one-race schools may differ in other District reports if these separate and unique campuses are not included.

The total number and percentage of one-race schools increased for 1983-84 as compared to 1982-83. The number and percentage of one-race schools increased at each level this year compared to last year.

There was only one one-race White school in the District. All the remaining one-race schools District-wide were one-race minority schools.

The schools presented in Table 2 changed in one-race status from 1982-83 to 1983-84.

Table 2

Schools District-wide Which Changed in One-race School Status

	Racially Isolated?	
	1982-83	1983-84
Jefferson Elem.	No	Yes
Scroggins Elem.	No	Yes
Fleming Jr.	No	Yes
Jackson Middle	No	Yes
Madison Sr.	No	Yes
J.W. Jones Elem.	Yes	No
Hartman Middle	Yes	No

Two elementary schools, one middle school, one junior high school and one senior high school, which were not classified as one-race schools in 1982-83, fell back into the one-race minority category for 1983-84. One elementary school and one middle school, which were classified as racially isolated in 1982-83, were reclassified as integrated for 1983-84.

Racially Isolated Magnet Schools

Of the 64 Magnet school campuses (excluding Cluster Centers), six elementary schools, one junior high school and seven high school Magnet campuses were classified as one-race minority schools using the TEA Fall Survey.

Elementary. Of the 34 elementary Magnet school campuses (excluding Cluster Centers), six were classified one-race minority schools, i.e., 90% or more minority enrollment. They are listed in Table 3. Of these six, five are school-within-a-school (SWS) Magnets and one is an add-on program serving the total school (AOP).

TABLE 3

One-race Minority Elementary Magnet School Campuses

Burrus (SWS)
Codwell (AOP)
Lantrip (SWS)
Ross (SWS)
Scroggins (SWS)
Whidby (SWS)

J.W. Jones (SWS), which was on this list last year, was classified as integrated this year. Burrus, Codwell, Lantrip, Ross and Whidby were one-race minority schools last year also.

Secondary. Of the 25 secondary Magnet schools, eight were classified one-race minority schools. These are listed in Table 4.

Table 4

One-race Minority Secondary Magnet School Campuses

Austin (SWS)
Davis (SWS)
Fleming (SWS)
Jones (SWS)
B. Jordan (SU)
Sterling (SWS)
B.T. Washington (SWS)
Yates (SWS)

Fleming was classified as integrated last year. This was Austin's first year as a Magnet school. All the one-race minority secondary schools listed above were listed as one-race minority schools last year also.

It should be noted that of the 14 one-race Magnet school campuses, 12 have Magnet programs which are school-within-a-school.

District Enrollment

The total enrollment in the District's regular schools and Magnet schools for the past eight years is presented in Table 5. The TEA Fall Survey was used for this table.

Table 5

District Enrollment and Ethnic Percentages*

	Total Enrollment	Black/Hispanic		White/Other	
	N	N	%	N	%
1975-76	211,125	132,799	62.9	78,326	37.1
1976-77	209,575	136,059	64.9	73,516	35.1
1977-78	206,528	137,944	66.8	68,584	33.2
1978-79	201,153	139,089	69.1	62,064	30.9
1979-80	193,186	136,862	70.8	56,324	29.2
1980-81	192,349	139,749	72.1	52,600	27.3
1981-82	191,952	142,145	74.1	49,807	25.9
1982-83	192,610	144,530	75.0	48,080	25.0
1983-84	187,635	143,612	76.5	44,023	23.5

*Does not include special services schools: H.P. Carter, Contemporary Occupational Training Center, Gulf Coast Trades Center and Harris County Youth Village.

Since 1975-76 the District enrollment has been decreasing steadily. This year enrollment decreased 4,975 students. The number and percentage of White students has continued to decrease since 1975-76.

This decline of one-race schools since the baseline year 1974-75 represents a move away from ethnic isolation in HISD at all school levels. The past eight years' data indicate that some level of stability has been achieved, given the District's population shifts and reorganization of junior highs to

middle schools. It may be concluded that the Magnet School Plan has successfully met the first court-defined objective.

The second objective states that HISD will reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more White or combined Black and Hispanic.

In 1974-75, 114,143 students attended one-race schools. The October, 1983, TEA Fall Survey indicates that only 88,087 students attended one-race schools in 1983-84; an increase of 3,039 students as compared to 1982-83. District enrollment has changed in the last eight years; therefore, examination of the percentage of students in one-race schools is more meaningful. The percentage of students enrolled in one-race schools is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Percentage of Students Attending One-race Schools

	Elementary	Middle/Junior High	Senior High	Total
1974-75 Baseline	57.6%	46.3%	56.9%	54.9%
1975-76	52.6%	40.8%	55.8%	50.2%
1976-77	50.8%	37.2%	48.9%	47.0%
1977-78	50.1%	37.5%	39.9%	45.0%
1978-79	49.1%	37.0%	37.4%	43.9%
1979-80	48.7%	39.1%	38.3%	44.4%
1980-81	50.3%	37.1%	39.5%	45.0%
1981-82	51.7%	37.4%	38.0%	45.4%
1982-83	50.0%	38.9%	37.9%	44.7%
1983-84	49.9%	42.4%	44.9%	46.9%

The figures in this table for years 1979-80 through 1983-84 are based on regular and Magnet schools only, excluding special services schools.

Data from Table 6 reveal that a smaller percentage of students are attending one-race schools now as compared to the 1974-75 baseline period. The total percentage of the District's students attending one-race schools appears to be

stabilizing. We can conclude, therefore, that the District's desegregation efforts are having a positive effect on the percentage of students attending one-race schools.

Another comparison which demonstrates the effectiveness of HISD desegregation efforts is a comparison of the percentages of students of different ethnic groups who attend school on campuses where their ethnic group is in the majority, that is, at or above 90%. This year only one school, an elementary school, had an enrollment that was over 90% White.

Of the 106 one-race schools, 105 had student enrollments which were 90% or more Black and/or Hispanic students. A total of 84,412 Black and Hispanic students were enrolled in these 105 one-race minority schools during 1983-84. This total represents 58.8% of the 143,612 Black and Hispanic students enrolled in all HISD schools.

Overall, only 1.5% of all White students enrolled in HISD attended schools where their ethnic group comprised 90% or more of the student body. A total of 58.8% of all Black and Hispanic students enrolled in HISD attended schools where their ethnic group or combined ethnic group comprised 90% or more of the student body. While the percentage of Black and Hispanic students attending schools where their ethnic group comprises 90% or more of the student body is high, when one considers the ethnic makeup of HISD as a whole, it is doubtful that significant reduction of this percentage can be expected without the addition of large numbers of White students to the HISD total enrollment. With this taken into consideration, it may be concluded that the Magnet School Plan, in concert with other District efforts, has successfully met this objective.

The third objective states that HISD will provide free transportation upon request to all students attending Magnet schools outside their attendance zone.

The District Court decree allowing implementation of the Magnet School Plan required the District to provide free transportation to students attending a Magnet School outside their attendance zone. As a result, only "inter-school" transfer students were eligible for free transportation. To determine if the District was providing free transportation to Magnet School students, a brief questionnaire was sent to the Transportation Department to gather the following data:

1) Total number of students transported in HISD

2) Total number of Magnet students transported

3) Total number of transportation vehicles used and the total number of transportation vehicles used to transport Magnet students

4) Total number of transportation routes and the number of routes used to transport Magnet students

5) Transportation costs per mile

6) Approximate annual cost per student for Magnet school students and for non-Magnet school students.

During the 1983-1984 school year, the Transportation Department reported transporting 37,655 students. Of these, 12,827 students were being transported to Magnet schools. This is an increase of 700 students over the 1982-1983 school year. This total includes majority-to-minority (M to M) transfer students who attend Magnet school campuses but are not enrolled in the Magnet school program. Since the Transportation Department does not separate M to M transfer students in their record keeping, it is not possible to specify precisely what proportion of Magnet school transfer students were transported. The Transportation Department indicated that every effort is made to transport all Magnet school students who apply before the June 15 deadline. After bus routes are established in the summer, students are provided transportation as room on the bus routes is available.

The Transportation Department utilized a total of 708 school buses, of which 352 were used to transport Magnet students. There were a total of 646 transportation routes, of which 304 were Magnet. The cost per mile for bus transportation for Magnet students or M to M students was $1.32. During the 1983-1984 school year, the annual cost of transporting Magnet students was $463.65 per student as compared to $93.62 per regular student and $1,308.69 per special education student. These costs per mile are based on the total miles traveled for the year.

The greater cost per student for Magnet school transportation provides an additional indication of the District's commitment to provide free transportation.

It is evident that the District is committed to providing free transportation for students attending Magnet schools outside their regular attendance zone. It can be concluded that the Magnet School Plan has successfully met the third objective.

The fourth objective states that HISD will report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet school biannually.

The District provides student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group as part of a larger report to the court as prescribed. In this report student enrollment figures only will be presented.

The District ethnic goal for Magnet school programs designated as satellite campuses was 35% White and 65% minority. Maximum enrollment for either minority group was limited to the percentage of students enrolled District-wide as reported on the previous year's TEA Fall Survey. Magnet school programs on campuses designated as In-Town Consortium schools were given the goal of 50% minority and 50% White. Since last year was the first year of this new goal for many of the Magnet schools, it was applicable to entry level grades and

other grades as occurring vacancies were filled. Determining whether a campus has met its ethnic ratio is further complicated by the fact that after July 1, In-Town Consortium Schools were allowed to revert to the ethnic ratio of 65%/35%, either minority or White being the greater percentage.

Student enrollment in Magnet schools is summarized in the following five tables (7-11). These data represent actual student enrollment as reported by individual programs in May, 1984.

Table 7

Final Student Enrollment for Add-On Magnet Programs

	Black		Hispanic		Total %	White		
	N	%	N	%	Minority	N	%	Total
Elementary								
Bell	208	30.0	51	7.4	37.4	434	62.6	693
Berry	223	22.6	653	66.1	88.7	112	11.3	988
Bruce	375	60.8	138	22.4	83.1	104	16.9	617
Codwell	568	88.9	7	1.1	90.0	64	10.0	639
Elrod	336	49.8	67	9.9	59.7	272	40.3	675
Garden Villas	263	37.4	194	27.6	64.9	247	35.1	704
*Horn	129	36.0	43	12.0	48.0	186	52.0	358
*Longfellow	141	37.0	57	15.0	52.0	183	48.0	381
Lovett	165	34.1	32	6.6	40.7	287	59.3	484
*MacGregor	354	76.1	39	8.4	84.5	72	15.5	465
*Poe	196	31.3	113	18.0	49.3	318	50.7	627
Pugh	12	1.3	811	87.5	88.8	104	11.2	927
*Roberts	165	36.7	72	16.0	52.7	213	47.3	450
*W. University	56	10.5	19	3.6	14.1	456	85.9	531
*W. Rogers	195	30.5	220	34.4	64.9	224	35.1	639
*Shearn	229	46.0	171	34.3	80.3	98	19.7	498
SUBTOTAL	3615	37.4	2687	27.8	65.1	3374	34.9	9676
Middle/Jr.								
Clifton	464	35.4	327	24.9	60.3	520	39.7	1311
Holland	532	45.0	403	34.1	79.1	247	20.9	1182
Revere	140	8.5	169	10.4	19.0	1320	81.0	1629
SUBTOTAL	1136	27.6	899	21.8	49.4	2087	50.6	4122
Senior								
Reagan	146	21.4	402	59.0	80.5	133	19.5	681
TOTAL ADD-ON	4897	33.8	3988	27.5	61.4	5594	38.6	14479

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools — 50% Minority - 50% White
Satellite Magnet Schools — 65% Minority - 35% White

Table 8

Final Student Enrollment for School-Within A School Magnet Programs

	Black		Hispanic		Total %	White			
	N	%	N	%	Minority	N	%	Total	Goal
Elementary									
Askew	45	31.3	38	26.4	57.6	61	42.4	144	150
Burbank	64	35.2	53	29.1	64.3	65	35.7	182	180
Burrus	101	40.1	64	25.4	65.5	87	34.5	252	250
Cornelius	103	34.2	89	29.6	63.8	109	36.2	301	300
*Dodson	51	29.1	38	21.7	50.9	86	49.1	175	175
A. Jones	36	27.1	69	51.9	78.9	28	21.1	133	120
*J. W. Jones	59	38.6	21	13.7	52.3	73	47.7	153	150
Lantrip	34	28.1	45	37.2	65.3	42	34.7	121	130
Lovett	87	46.3	18	9.6	55.9	83	44.1	188	200
*MacGregor	28	28.0	13	13.0	41.0	59	59.0	100	100
Oak Forest	63	42.0	34	22.7	64.7	53	35.3	150	150
Parker	148	42.8	77	22.3	65.0	121	35.0	346	350
Pleasantville	77	39.7	34	17.5	57.2	83	42.8	194	225
*River Oaks	65	23.9	67	24.6	48.5	140	51.5	272	275
*Roberts	47	39.5	10	8.4	47.9	62	52.1	119	125
T. H. Rogers	82	26.3	41	13.1	39.4	189	60.6	312	350
*W. Rogers	133	50.8	29	11.1	61.8	100	38.2	262	250
Roosevelt	44	31.9	38	27.5	59.4	56	40.6	138	150
Ross	54	38.6	28	20.0	58.6	58	41.4	140	150
Scroggins	46	33.3	55	39.9	73.2	37	26.8	138	150
Wainwright	58	33.1	56	32.0	65.1	61	34.9	175	175
Whidby	30	41.1	5	6.8	47.9	38	52.1	73	75
*Wilson	58	33.9	31	18.1	52.0	82	48.0	171	150
Windsor Village	101	38.4	23	8.7	47.1	139	52.9	263	275
SUBTOTAL	1614	35.9	976	21.7	57.5	1912	42.5	4502	
Middle/Jr.									
Burbank	67	26.9	71	28.5	55.4	111	44.6	249	275
Clifton	93	37.1	57	22.7	59.8	101	40.2	251	250
Fleming	163	46.7	79	22.6	69.3	107	30.6	349	300
*Gregory/Lincoln	71	39.4	25	13.9	53.3	84	46.7	180	200
Hamilton	112	44.3	54	21.3	65.6	87	34.4	253	275
Hartman	123	42.4	73	25.2	67.6	94	32.4	290	300
*Lanier	157	33.7	71	15.2	48.9	238	51.1	466	450
*Pershing	76	22.2	18	5.3	27.5	248	72.5	342	375
Welch	143	39.6	92	25.5	65.1	126	34.9	361	360
SUBTOTAL	1005	36.7	540	19.7	56.4	1196	43.6	2741	

Student Enrollment for School-Within a School
Cont.

	Black N	Black %	Hispanic N	Hispanic %	Total % Minority	White N	White %	Total	Goal
Senior									
Austin	4	6.0	51	76.1	82.1	12	17.9	67	200
Bellaire	35	10.7	42	12.8	23.5	251	76.5	328	600
Davis	46	26.9	85	49.7	76.6	40	23.4	171	200
Furr	11	26.8	16	39.0	65.9	14	34.1	41	200
Jones	147	63.6	14	6.1	69.7	70	30.3	231	300
*Lamar	76	39.4	16	8.3	47.7	101	52.3	193	200
Milby	88	33.5	109	41.4	74.9	66	25.1	263	280
Reagan	8	11.0	29	39.7	50.7	36	49.3	73	100
Sterling	23	22.1	28	26.9	49.0	53	51.0	104	160
B.T. Washington	235	55.0	74	17.3	72.4	118	27.6	427	450
Yates	141	72.7	20	10.3	83.0	33	17.0	194	300
SUBTOTAL	814	38.9	484	23.1	62.0	794	38.0	2092	
TOTAL SWS	3433	36.8	2000	21.4	58.2	3902	41.8	9335	

* In-Town Consortium Magnet Schools — 50% Minority - 50% White
Satellite Magnet Schools — 65% Minority - 35% White

Table 9
Final Student Enrollment for Separate and Unique
Magnet Schools

	Black N	Black %	Hispanic N	Hispanic %	Total % Minority	White N	White %	Total
Middle/Junior								
*Contemporary Learning Center (CLC)	94	51.4	41	22.4	73.8	48	26.2	183
Senior								
*CLC	263	60.9	58	13.4	74.3	111	25.7	432
*Health Professions	403	54.8	131	17.8	72.7	201	27.3	735
Barbara Jordan	816	78.2	178	17.1	95.3	49	4.7	1043
Law Enforcement/ Criminal Justice	209	45.0	161	34.7	79.7	94	20.3	464
*Performing and Visual Arts (HSPVA)	120	21.1	53	9.3	30.4	397	69.6	570
SUBTOTAL	1811	55.8	581	17.9	73.4	852	26.3	3244
TOTAL	1905	55.6	622	18.1	73.7	900	26.3	3427

* In-Town Consortium Schools

Table 10

Final Student Participation for Cluster Center Magnet Programs

	Black		Hispanic		Total %	White		
	N	%	N	%	Minority	N	%	Total
People Place	1933	33.8	1713	29.9	63.7	2077	36.3	5723
Children's Literature	909	38.7	620	26.4	65.1	819	34.9	2348
Career Orientation	1120	36.9	822	27.1	64.1	1090	35.9	3032
International Trade	1194	36.2	950	28.8	65.0	1152	35.0	3296
Outdoor Education	2970	43.9	1891	28.0	71.9	1898	28.1	6759
Wildlife Discovery	787	33.0	834	35.0	68.0	762	32.0	2383
Total Cluster Centers	8913	37.9	6830	29.0	66.9	7798	33.1	23,541

Table 11

Final Student Enrollment in All Magnet Programs

	Black		Hispanic		Total %	White		Total
	N	%	N	%	Minority	N	%	Participation
Elementary	4934	29.9	3593	21.8	51.7	4982	30.2	13,509
Middle/Junior	2048	31.0	1382	20.9	51.9	3182	48.1	6,612
Senior	2771	46.1	1467	24.4	70.4	1779	29.6	6,017
Subtotal	9753	37.3	6442	24.6	62.0	9943	38.0	26,138
Cluster Centers	8913	37.9	6830	29.0	66.9	7798	33.1	23,541
Grand Total	18,666	37.6	13,272	26.7	64.3	17,741	35.7	49,679

*Adjusted so that students enrolled in Magnet Schools with two programs are not counted twice.

District Ethnic Goals Across Magnet Campuses

The data reported in Tables 7 through 11 suggest that, taken as a whole, the several categories of Magnet school programs were successful in attracting students from the District's three ethnic groups. Transfer students leave their home schools to transfer to Magnet schools or they are part of their home school's school-within-a-school (SWS) Magnet program. Of the 17,630 students designated in May as Magnet school transfer students for the 1983-84 school year, 7,390 students (41.8%) were Black, 3,485 students (19.7%) were Hispanic, and 6,805 students (38.5%) were White. The combined Black and Hispanic enrollment was 61.5%. This total also includes 1,137 VIEP (Voluntary Interdistrict Education Plan) students who do not reside in HISD. The total number of transfer students increased for 1983-84 by 1,713 students. The number of Black students increased by 746, White by 9,681 and Hispanic decreased by 1. Of the 837 VIEP transfer students, 666 or 58.6% were White.

A program-wide total of 26,138 students were enrolled as full time students in Magnet schools. This is an increase of approximately 891 students over last year's total. Of these, 9,753 (37.3%) were Black students, 6,442 (24.6%) were Hispanic students and 9,943 (38.0%) were White students. The total percentage of minority students (Black and Hispanic combined) was 62.0%.

In addition to the 26,138 full time students in Magnet schools, 23,541 students participated in Cluster Center (short term) Magnet schools. Examples of the content taught in short-term Magnet schools include international trade, children's literature, career awareness, multicultural awareness, outdoor education/ecology and wildlife. Students from schools which are not tri-ethnic attend the Centers according to the established District ethnic ratios.

Although sending schools are given a quota of students per ethnic group, principals in most instances will send an entire class of students without regard to the ethnic quota given. This is done so students do not feel left out. This limits Cluster Center coordinators' control of the ethnic percentages since there are so few schools in which White students are in the majority.

Campuses on which Magnet Schools are located receive several benefits from the Magnet School Program. Pupil/teacher ratios on these campuses are lowered to 25 to 1. Additional curriculum specialists and support personnel are assigned to Magnet school campuses and funds for additional material and supplies are allotted to them. Students who attend school on a campus which also houses a Magnet School share in these benefits. A total of 36,379 non-Magnet students received these indirect Magnet school benefits this year.

District-wide, the education of a total of 86,058 students was affected both directly and indirectly by HISD's Magnet School Program. These students represented 45.9% of the District's total enrollment of 187,635. These data, together with data related to individual Magnet Schools, indicate that the Magnet School Program was successful in attracting and serving a multi-ethnic student population.

District Ethnic Goal by Magnet Campus

SWS Satellite Magnet Programs. Of the seventeen elementary and sixteen secondary school-within-a-school (SWS) satellite Magnet programs, six elementary and five secondary were within 5% variance of the District's ethnic enrollment goal of 35% White and 65% minority with no more than 44.1% Black and 30.9% Hispanic based on May, 1983, enrollment figures. These schools are listed below in Table 12.

Table 12

SWS Magnet Satellite Programs Which Met District's Ethnic Enrollment Goal

Elementary:	Burbank
	Burrus
	Cornelius
	Oak Forest
	Parker
	Wainwright
Secondary:	Clifton
	Fleming
	Hamilton
	Hartman
	Welch

The following four SWS Satellite Magnet programs met the enrollment guidelines of 35% White and 65% minority but exceeded 44.1% Black or 30.9% Hispanic: Lantrip, W. Rogers, Furr, Jones Senior, and High School for Engineering Professions.

Table 13

Final Student Enrollment for In-Town Consortium
Magnet School Programs

Add-On Programs

	Black		Hispanic		Total %	White		
	N	%	N	%	Minority	N	%	Total
Elementary								
Horn	129	36.0	43	12.0	48.0	186	52.0	358
Longfellow	141	37.0	57	15.0	52.0	183	48.0	381
MacGregor	354	76.1	39	8.4	84.5	72	15.5	465
Poe	196	31.3	113	18.0	49.3	318	50.7	627
Roberts	165	36.7	72	16.0	52.7	213	47.3	450
W. University	56	10.5	19	3.6	14.1	456	85.9	531
W. Rogers	195	30.5	220	34.4	64.9	224	35.1	639
Shearn	229	46.0	171	34.3	80.3	98	19.7	498
TOTAL	1465	37.1	734	18.6	55.7	1750	44.3	3949

School-Within-a-School

	Black		Hispanic		Total %	White			
	N	%	N	%	Minority	N	%	Total	Goal
Elementary									
Dodson	51	29.1	38	21.7	50.9	86	49.1	175	175
J.W. Jones	59	38.6	21	13.7	52.3	73	47.7	153	150
MacGregor	28	28.0	13	13.0	41.0	59	59.0	100	100
River Oaks	65	23.9	67	24.6	48.5	140	51.5	272	275
Roberts	47	39.5	10	8.4	47.9	62	52.1	119	125
W. Rogers	133	50.8	29	11.1	61.8	100	38.2	262	250
Wilson	58	33.9	31	18.1	52.0	82	48.0	171	150
SUBTOTAL	441	35.2	209	16.7	51.9	602	48.1	1252	
Middle/Jr.									
Gregory-Lincoln	71	39.4	25	13.9	53.3	84	46.7	180	200
Lanier	157	33.7	71	15.2	48.9	238	51.1	466	450
Pershing	76	22.2	18	5.3	27.5	248	72.5	342	375
SUBTOTAL	304	30.8	114	11.5	42.3	570	57.7	988	
Senior									
Lamar	76	39.4	16	8.3	47.7	101	52.3	193	200
TOTAL	821	33.7	339	13.9	47.7	1273	52.3	2433	

Separate and Unique

	Black N	Black %	Hispanic N	Hispanic %	Total % Minority	White N	White %	Total
Middle/Junior								
Contemporary Learning Center (CLC)	94	51.4	41	22.4	73.8	48	26.2	183
Senior								
CLC	263	60.9	58	13.4	74.3	111	25.7	432
Health Professions	403	54.8	131	17.8	72.7	201	27.3	735
Performing and Visual Arts (HSPVA)	120	21.1	53	9.3	30.4	397	69.6	570
SUBTOTAL	786	45.3	242	13.9	59.2	709	40.8	1737
TOTAL	880	45.8	283	14.7	60.6	757	39.4	1920

SWS In-Town Consortium Magnet Programs. The District's ethnic goals for the group of Magnet programs designated as In-Town Consortium is 50% minority and 50% White. These programs were to begin working toward this goal for 1983-84 for entry level grades. For this reason, it is difficult to specify schools in this group which are not meeting the ethnic goals. The reader is referred to Table 13 for end of year ethnic enrollment figures.

Add-on-Program and Separate and Unique Magnets. Magnet school transfer policy wording for AOP Magnet schools is vague and difficult to measure. "The goal at each school with an add-on program or which is a separate and unique school is to achieve the most integration possible." However, the preceding paragraph of the Magnet school transfer policy states, "Most Add-on programs and Separate and Unique schools add the goal of decreasing the number of one-race schools. Some...are designed primarily to help stabilize a school's integrated enrollment." These two goals can be measured.

Of the twenty AOP Magnet schools, all were classified as racially integrated 1983-84, based on May enrollment figures. Codwell moved out of the one-race minority school classification this year. White enrollment increased at eight schools and decreased at twelve schools. These schools are listed below in Table 14.

Table 14

Percentage of White Enrollment at AOP Magnet Schools

AOP/Total Magnets	% White Enrollment 1982-83	1983-84	% Change
Bell	69.2	62.6	- 6.6
Berry	10.7	11.3	+ 0.6
Bruce	21.4	16.9	- 4.5
Codwell	4.6	10.0	+ 5.4
Elrod	**45.2	40.3	- 4.9
Garden Villas	33.0	35.1	+ 2.1
*Horn	63.0	52.0	-11.0
*Longfellow	46.1	48.0	+ 1.9
Lovett	56.4	59.3	+ 2.9
*MacGregor	16.0	15.5	- 0.5
*Poe	43.9	50.7	+ 6.8
Pugh	11.3	11.2	- 0.1
*Roberts	41.8	47.3	+ 5.5
*W. Rogers	35.2	35.1	- 0.1
Shearn	24.4	19.7	- 4.7
*West University	**87.2	85.9	- 1.3
Clifton	44.0	39.7	- 4.3
Holland	22.5	20.9	- 1.6
Revere	80.8	81.0	+ 0.2
Reagan	25.6	19.5	- 6.1

* In-Town Consortium School
** New Magnet program for 1983-84, White enrollment for 1982-83 was taken from TEA Fall 1982 survey when it was not a Magnet school.

Magnet schools which have no zoned home school population are called separate and unique. Of the six separate and unique Magnets, one, Barbara Jordan, is classified as a one-race minority school. Table 15 lists these schools with their percentage of White enrollment for the past two years.

Table 15

Percentage of White Enrollment at Separate and Unique Magnet Schools for May, 1982 and May, 1983

	Percentage of White Enrollment 1982-83	1983-84	% Change
CLC Middle	37.4	26.2	-11.2
CLC H. S.	33.9	25.7	- 8.2
Health Professions	25.3	27.3	+ 2.0
HSPVA	66.8	69.6	+ 2.8
Barbara Jordan	5.3	4.7	- 0.6
Law Enforcement	21.2	20.3	- 0.9

It is evident that although many Magnet Schools experienced difficulty in recruiting and enrolling students, the Magnet School Plan was fairly successful in establishing and maintaining integrated student enrollments. Overall, it can be said that the Magnet School Plan has been able to establish and maintain integrated educational settings. It may be concluded that the Magnet School Plan has successfully met the fourth objective.

Summary of Court-Related Objectives

The four court-related objectives were met during Phase VIII of the Magnet School Plan. It is apparent from data presented that there has been a reduction in the number of ethnically isolated schools and in the number of students attending ethnically isolated schools since the Magnet School Plan began operation. Additionally, free transportation for Magnet School transfer students and ethnically balanced alternative educational programs were provided.

Performance Objective Attainment

The court related objectives are intended to guarantee a degree of desegregation within the Houston Independent School District. They do not speak to the quality of the instructional program at any Magnet school. Each Magnet school instructional program is defined by performance objectives. The specific objectives for 1983-84 from each Magnet school program and the degree to which these objectives were met are discussed in campus level final audit reports. A brief discussion of the total number of objectives proposed and accomplished and specific problems encountered with attainment of the objectives lends insight into the quality of the Magnet School Plan as a whole.

A total of 361 objectives for the 70 Magnet schools were approved for the 1983-84 school year.

Five new Magnet schools were included this year; two elementary (Elrod Math/Science and West University Math/Science) and three high schools (Austin Teaching Professions, Furr Teaching Professions and Lamar Business Professions). One school's Magnet program was redirected; the Reagan campus changed its focus to computer technology/CAI.

The number of objectives per school ranged from three to nine. The average number of objectives per school was 5.2, slightly lower than the 5.3 during the 1982-83 school year. The median number of objectives was five.

Objectives were most frequently written in the areas of recruitment/enrollment, achievement in the Magnet school's program area, Magnet related objectives and academic achievement as measured by standardized tests. The number of objectives proposed and met by each Magnet school program are presented in Table 16 which follows. It should be noted that campus level objectives vary in difficulty as well as category. Caution should be used in interpreting these performance data. While trends may be seen in improving attainment of objectives across the District, the level of difficulty has not always remained constant. The reader should refer to campus level Magnet final audit reports for information about specific performance objectives.

Table 16

Number of Objectives Proposed and Met
by Magnet Schools

Elementary (N = 36)	Objectives Proposed	Objectives Met
Askew Vanguard	7	6
Bell Physical Development	6	6
Berry Ecology and Outdoor Ed.	4	4
Bruce Music	4	4
Burbank Extended Day	4	4
Burrus Fine Arts	5	5
Codwell Physical Development	4	4
Cornelius Math/Science	6	6
Dodson Montessori	7	7
Elrod/Math Science	4	3
Garden Villas Music	5	5
Horn Academy	3	3
Anson Jones Bilingual/Multicultural	6	5
J. Will Jones Extended Day	6	6
Lantrip Ecology	4	4
Longfellow Fine Arts	4	3
Lovett Fine Arts/Extended Day	4	4
MacGregor Music/Science/Extended Day	6	6
Oak Forest Vanguard	8	8
Parker Music	4	4
Pleasantville Vanguard	8	7
Poe Fine Arts	4	4
Pugh Fundamental	4	4
River Oaks Vanguard	8	8
Roberts Physical Development	6	6
T. H. Rogers Vanguard	9	9
Will Rogers Educational Enrichment/ Extended Day	7	7
Roosevelt Vanguard	7	6
Ross Math/Science	4	4
Scroggins Literature and Art	5	4
Shearn Foreign Language	4	3
Wainwright Math/Science	4	4
West University Math/Science	4	4
Whidby Montessori	5	5
Wilson Extended Day	6	6
Windsor Village Vanguard	8	8
Subtotal	194	186

Cluster Center (N = 6)	Objectives Proposed	Objectives Met
Anderson People Place	4	4
Briargrove Children's Literature	5	5
Outdoor Education	6	6
Port Houston International Trade Center	3	3
Sinclair Career Orientation	3	3
Wildlife Discovery Center	8	8
Subtotal	29	29

Middle/Junior (N = 12)	Objectives Proposed	Objectives Met
Burbank Middle Vanguard	8	8
Clifton Middle Math/Science	4	4
Contemporary Learning Center Middle School	5	4
Fleming Junior Fine Arts	4	4
Gregory-Lincoln Middle Fine Arts	6	6
Hamilton Middle Vanguard	8	8
Hartman Junior Math/Science	5	5
Holland Middle	4	3
Lanier Middle Vanguard	8	8
Pershing Middle Pre-IB	5	3
Revere Middle Math/Science	5	5
Welch Middle Music/Physical Development	5	5
Subtotal	67	63

Senior (N = 16)	Objectives Proposed	Objectives Met
Austin Teaching Professions	4	3
Bellaire Foreign Language	3	2
Contemporary Learning Center High School	5	3
Davis Hospitality Careers	3	2
Furr Teaching Professions	5	3
High School for Engineering Professions	5	5
High School for Health Professions	4	4
High School for Performing & Visual Arts	6	6
Jones Vanguard	8	8
Barbara Jordan	4	3
Lamar Business Professions	4	4
Law Enforcement	4	4
Milby Petro-Chemical	3	2
Reagan Computer Technology/CAI	3	1
Sterling Aviation Sciences	4	4
Yates Communications	6	4
Subtotal	71	58

TOTAL (N = 70)	361	336

Examination of Table 16 shows that of the 361 objectives proposed for 1983-84, 336 (93%) were met. This percentage is slightly higher than the percentage met last year.

The number and percentage of proposed objectives met by school level are shown in Table 17. The 36 elementary schools met 186 of their 194 objectives for 1983-84. Junior high/middle schools achieved 63 of their 67 proposed objectives; senior highs 58 of their 71 objectives; and cluster centers all 29 of their proposed objectives.

Table 17

Number and Percent of Objectives
Proposed and Met by Magnet School Level

School Level	N	Objectives Met	Objectives Proposed	Percent
Elementary	36	186	194	96%
Junior High/Middle	12	63	67	94%
Senior High	16	58	71	82%
Cluster Centers	6	29	29	100%
Total	70	336	361	93%

Table 18 presents the number of objectives met and proposed, the percent met, and the number of Magnet schools for the 1976-77 through the 1983-84 school years.

Table 18

Number and Percent of Objectives Proposed and Met
by Magnet School Level for the Past Seven Years

School Level	Elementary	Middle/Junior	Senior	Cluster	Total
1977-78	125/134 93% N = 28	13/18 72% N = 5	26/36 72% N = 9	21/21 100% N = 5	185/209 86.5% N = 47
1978-79	121/140 83% N = 31	18/25 72% N = 6	33/46 72% N = 10	22/24 92% N = 5	194/235 82.6% N = 52
1979-80	114/141 81% N = 31	34/41 83% N = 10	26/43 61% N = 10	18/22 82% N = 5	192/247 77.7% N = 56
1980-81	125/150 83% N = 32	27/37 73% N = 10	36/58 62% N = 14	17/18 94% N = 5	205/263 77.9% N = 61
1981-82	142/165 86% N = 32	44/55 80% N = 11	45/64 70% N = 14	16/19 84% N = 5	247/303 81.5% N = 62
1982-83	173/187 93% N = 34	58/65 89% N = 12	59/64 92% N = 13	24/26 92% N = 6	314/342 91.8% N = 65
1983-84	186/194 96% N = 36	63/67 94% N = 12	58/71 82% N = 16	29/29 100% N = 6	336/361 93% N = 70

An improvement in the percentage of objectives achieved over the 1982-83 school year was found at the elementary and junior high/middle school levels and at the cluster centers. The percentage of objectives met at the senior high level dropped from 92% to 82% in the 1983-84 school year. The number of objectives proposed increased at all levels in 1983-84.

A final analysis of program objective attainment involved identifying the types of objectives written and those most frequently not met. Table 19 shows the 361 objectives for 1983-84 by type and level.

Table 19

Type and Level of Objectives
Written for 1983-84

Type Of Objective	Secondary	Elementary	Cluster	Total
Recruitment/Enrollment	30	36	6	72
Academic Achievement	23	21	0	44
Magnet Curriculum Achievement	24	47	10	81
Performance	4	14	0	18
Curriculum Development/Revision	23	28	8	59
Parental/Community Involvement	9	14	1	24
Inservice	9	22	0	31
Attitude	7	2	4	13
Other	9	10	0	20
Total	138	194	29	361

A total of 25 of the 361 objectives were not met. Table 20 presents those objectives for 1983-84 by type and level.

Table 20

Number of Objectives
Not Met by Type and Level

Type Of Objective	Secondary	Elementary	Cluster	Total By Type
Recruitment/Enrollment	8	4	0	12
Academic Achievement	5	1	0	6
Magnet Curriculum Achievement	3	2	0	5
Other	1	1	0	2
Total By Level	17	8	0	25

SUMMARY

The goal of the Magnet School Plan is to provide high quality alternative educational programs which attract students from all geographic and ethnic sectors of the District. Data reported by the individual Magnet schools, and substantiated by program audits and site visits by personnel from the District's Planning, Research, and Evaluation Department, indicate that the Magnet School Plan has been successful in accomplishing its stated goals. A total of 78 alternative educational programs have been established and operated during the 1983-84 school year. The 78 programs, located on 70 campuses, represent all grade levels, pre-k through 12, and range from fine arts programs to extended instructional day programs and programs for the academically-able student.

During 1983-84, the Magnet schools were able to accomplish their proposed program objectives. This level of achievement speaks well of the quality of the educational programs which are available through the Magnet School project.

A total of 86,058 students were affected directly or indirectly by Magnet school programs. Total full-time enrollment in Magnet School programs was 26,138 students. The ethnic makeup of the enrollment was 37.3% Black, 24.6% Hispanic, and 38.0% White. Considering all students who benefitted from lowered campus pupil/teacher ratios, the total number of students impacted by the Magnet School Program was 45.9% of the District's total enrollment of 187,635 regular students.

The Magnet School Plan, along with other District efforts, has resulted in a reduction in the number and percent of ethnically isolated schools in the Houston Independent School District as compared to the 1974-75 baseline year. The number and percent of students attending ethnically isolated schools has been reduced significantly. Students transferring to Magnet Schools have been provided, within guidelines, free, though not always convenient, transportation to school and home again. Students attending Magnet schools represent a tri-ethnic cross section of students in the District.

The Magnet School Plan has met the goals set forth for it to date. Expansion of the Magnet School Plan and refinement of existing programs will offer more students the opportunity to participate in what has proven to be an exciting, innovative and, to date, successful program.

CS12-4pah